

Swiftwater Stream Crossing Upgrade Project

EA# OR-104-04-04

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management, has analyzed a proposal called the **Swiftwater Stream Crossing Upgrade Project**. The proposed action would result in the replacement of stream crossing culverts at six sites within the Swiftwater Resource Area, located in the Elk Creek, Middle North Umpqua and Upper Calapooya fifth-field watersheds in Section 17, T.21S., R.4W.; Sections 15 and 27, T.22S., R.4W.; Section 3, T.25S., R.4W.; and Section 17, T.26S., R.2W.; W.M. This proposal is located on lands within the Riparian Reserve Land Use Allocation.

The Environmental Assessment (EA), contains a description and analysis of the proposed action. A summary of the analysis shows:

- 1). The project would not be expected to impact any special status plants (EA, pg. 2).
- 2). The Roseburg District's consultation for T&E wildlife species is covered under the *Formal Consultation and Written Concurrence on FY 2003-2008 Management Activities (Ref. # 1-15-03-F-160)* (Feb. 21, 2003) which concluded that the project would "... not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the spotted owl, murrelet and bald eagle, and are not likely to adversely modify spotted owl or murrelet critical habitat" (EA, pg. 6).
- 3). The Roseburg District's consultation for T&E fish species is covered under the *Programmatic Biological and Conference Opinion* (Oct. 18, 2002). The Biological Opinion (BO) concluded that the project "... is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of ... OC coho salmon, or OC steelhead". " In addition, the proposed activities were analyzed for, and determined to not adversely affect Essential Fisheries Habitat (EFH) (EA, pg. 6).
- 4). National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106) responsibilities under the 1997 National Programmatic Agreement and the 1998 Oregon Protocol has been completed. No consultation was required (EA, pg. 7).

This proposal is in conformance with the *"Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan"* (RMP) dated June 1995, the *"Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl"* (Feb. 1994) and the Record of Decision (ROD) for that plan dated April 13, 1994.

Finding of No Significant Impacts:

I have reviewed the tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached). Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared. In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines (S&G's, pg. B-10) I find that "the proposed activity is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives" and "meets" or "does not prevent attainment" of these objectives.

Jay K. Carlson
Swiftwater Field Manager

Date

Swiftwater Stream Crossing Project

Test for Significant Impacts. (516 DM 2 Appendix 2)

1. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? () Yes (✓) No
Remarks: Considering the remoteness of the project to local population centers, and the design features governing the proposal, the likelihood of the project affecting public health and safety is remote and speculative.
2. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks? () Yes (✓) No
Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Wildlife, Hydrology and Fisheries) does not show that the proposed action would affect any of the above characteristics (EA, pg. 4).
3. Has highly controversial effects? () Yes (✓) No
Remarks: No controversial effects are noted as a result of environmental analysis or public review.
4. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks? () Yes (✓) No
Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve unique or unknown risks.
5. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? () Yes (✓) No
Remarks: The replacement of culverts is a well-established practice and does not establish a precedent for future actions.
6. Is directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? () Yes (✓) No
Remarks: We find that this action would not have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment beyond that already identified in the EIS.
7. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? () Yes (✓) No
Remarks: The Cultural Report (12/22/03) does not indicate that this action would adversely affect any sites, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

8. Has adverse effects on species listed or proposed for listing on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species?

Aquatic Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Botanical Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Terrestrial Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Remarks: Consultation with the FWS and NOAA – fisheries has been accomplished under programmatic biological opinions (BO). The BO concludes that the project would result in a "may affect, not likely to adversely affect" determination for listed fish. Botanical surveys do not indicate the presence of any T&E plants. Consultation with the FWS is expected to result in a "may affect, not likely to adversely affect" to terrestrial species.

9. Requires compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplains Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: Area is not within a floodplain. "The selected alternative complies with Executive Order 11990 ..." (ROD, pg. 51). Project has been coordinated with FWS.

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: We find that this action would not threaten a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law imposed for the protection of the environment.